

Remarks/Argument

Claims 1, 3-11 are pending and claims 1, 3-11 stand rejected. In the amendment claims 1, 9 and 10 are amended and claim 3 is cancelled. In response to the office action dated April 15, 2008, the claim amendments and following comments are submitted and reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malkemes et al. (US 6,647,015), and further in view of Edson (US 6,526,581) . Amended claim 1 recites:

“Communication device comprising :

- external data sources,
- a local area network connecting peripherals,
- a plurality of means for establishing connections between the local area network and the external data sources upon request of a peripheral,
- means for controlling the incoming data from the external sources according to said request of the peripheral and for sending them to the local area network in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network,
- wherein said means for controlling the incoming data discards the incoming data not requested by said peripheral, in order to reduce the bandwidth occupation on the local area network said means for controlling comprising filtering means for removing some incoming data from the external sources to create a single program transport stream or a partial multiple transport stream for the local area network from the multiple program transport stream selected from the external source.”

In Malkemes, it is not described that the device comprises means for creating a single program transport stream or a partial multiple program transport stream for the local area network from the multiple program transport stream selected from the external source. This feature is also not disclosed in Edson. The Examiner says regarding previously presented claim 3, which corresponds to features of amended claim 1 that the combination of Malkemes and Edson suggest using a firewall (filtering means) to perform demultiplexing operations (Edson, figure 2). This however does not disclose that a single transport stream or a partial multiple program transport stream is created and therefore the Applicants consider that amended claim 1 is new and non-obvious in view of the cited documents.

Dependent claims 4-8 depend directly from independent claim 1 or other dependent claims dependent on claim 1 and recite additional features therefore. As such and for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicants submit that dependent claims 4-8 are also neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited documents.

Claim 9 utilizes a communication device according to claim 1. As claim 1 is believed allowable, claim 9 then is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to include the features of filtering said input data to remove some data from the external data sources to create a single program transport stream or a partial multiple transport stream for the local area network from the multiple program transport stream selected from the external source. These added features are not found in either Malkenes nor in Edson, thus claim 10 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 11 recites a computer program product comprising program instructions for executing the steps of the method for creating semantic browsing options according to claim 10, when said program is loaded on a computer. As claim 10 is believed to be allowable, then claim 11 is also allowable.

In view of the forgoing amendments and comments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw all rejections in the present application. Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (317) 937-

8898, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Claude Chapel et al

/Catherine A. Ferguson/
By: Catherine A. Ferguson
Reg. No. 40,877
Phone (609) 734-6440

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
August 4, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this amendment is being electronically transmitted to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

____August 4, 2008_____
Date

____Kathleen Lyles_____
Signature